



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,626	08/07/2001	Mehdi Bonakdar	C 2290 COGG	2081
23657	7590	06/29/2004	EXAMINER	
COGNIS CORPORATION PATENT DEPARTMENT 300 BROOKSIDE AVENUE AMBLER, PA 19002			QAZI, SABIHA NAIM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/923,626

**Applicant(s)**

BONAKDAR ET AL.

**Examiner**

Sabiha Qazi

**Art Unit**

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Non-Final Office Action**

Acknowledgment is made of the Appeal Brief filed on March 11, 2004. Finality of rejection is withdrawn. Claims 1-19 are pending. No claim is allowed at the present time.

**Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-19 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-32 of copending Application No. 09/923629. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

**Art Unit: 1616**

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter: a process for producing sterols. The claims in this application are very similar to the claims in Application No. 09/923629. No specific difference was found which could make these two applicants patentably distinct from one another.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5703252 (herein referred to as "HUNT '252") and US 5670669 (herein referred to as "HUNT '669").

HUNT '252 teaches a process for the recovery of tocopherols from a starting material containing fatty and sterol compounds, such as distillates of vegetable oils and fats (see the entire the entire document, especially col. 3, lines 46-67; col. 4, lines 23-58; col. 5, lines 20-67; examples and claims). The reference teaches:

(a) esterifying the free fatty acids preferably with a lower alcohol,

**Art Unit: 1616**

(b) transesterifying the fatty acid glyceride esters present by mixing said tocopherol mixture with a lower alcohol in the presence of a zinc catalyst,

(c) removal of the excess lower alcohol, zinc catalyst, fatty acid alkyl ester and glycerol and,

(d) for complete conversion of sterol esters in the tocopherol mixture to free sterols, reacting said tocopherol mixture obtained with a lower alcohol in the presence of an alkoxide catalyst in order to produce a tocopherol mixture containing free sterols and fatty acid alkyl esters (see col. 3, line 47 to col. 4, line 67).

Furthermore, HUNT '252 teaches the transesterification of sterol esters is preferably conducted at a temperature between about 1500°C and about 2400°C and in reaction times of 10 minutes or more, such as 1 to about 3 hours under pressure (see col. 6, lines 24-44).

HUNT '669 teaches a similar process for the recovery of tocopherols from a mixture comprising of fatty acids, sterols and tocopherols (see the entire document, especially col. 3, lines 12-64; col. 4, lines 1-43, col. 6, lines 50-67; col. 7, lines 1-51; examples, tables, and claims). The reference teaches (a) esterification of the free fatty acids present in the mixture with lower or higher alcohols (see col. 3, lines 19-22 and col. 4, lines 1-5), (b) transesterifying fatty acid esters present in the mixture with a lower alcohol in the presence of a basic catalyst such as potassium hydroxide and sodium methoxide (see col. 3, lines 23-25 and col. 9, lines 9-28) and (c) removal of excess lower alcohol, basic catalyst, fatty acid alkyl ester and glycerol (see col. 3, lines 26-35 and col. 6, line 67 - col. 7, line 13).

One skilled in the art would have been motivated to produce sterols in view of the teachings of the prior art cited above. The prior art teaches the recovery of sterols from starting

**Art Unit: 1616**

materials containing fatty and sterol compounds such as vegetable oils by a process comprising the removal of the free fatty acids by esterification; transesterification of the fatty acid glyceride esters in the presence of a lower alcohol and basic catalyst, removal of the excess alcohol, basic catalyst, fatty acid alkyl ester and glycerol, and conversion of the sterol esters in the product obtained by transesterification would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.

In absence of any criticality and/or unexpected results, presently claimed invention is considered obvious over the prior art cited above.

A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill might reasonably infer from the teachings. *In re opprecht* 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (Fed Cir. 1989); *In re Bode* 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA 1976). A reference is not limited to working examples. *In re Fracalossi* 215 USPQ 569 (CCPA 1982).

Accordingly, the burden of proof is upon applicants to show that instantly claimed subject matter is different and unobvious over those taught by prior art. See *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685, 688; *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430 and *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 293.

Normally, change in temperature, concentration, or both, is not a patentable modification; however, such changes may impart patentability to a process if the ranges claimed produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from results of prior art; such ranges are termed "critical" ranges, and applicant has burden of proving such criticality; even though applicant's modification results in great improvement and utility over prior art, it may still not be patentable if the modification was within the capabilities of one skilled in the art; more particularly, where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not

**Art Unit: 1616**

inventive to discover optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. In re Aller et al. 105 USPQ 233.

It is well established that merely selecting proportions and ranges is not patentable absent a showing of criticality. In re Becket, 33 U.S.P.Q. 33 (C.C.P.A. 1937). In re Russell, 439 F.2d 1228, 169 U.S.P.Q. 426 (C.C.P.A. 1971).

It is a general rule that merely discovering and claiming a new benefit of an *old* process cannot render the process again patentable. Nor can patentability be found in differences in ranges recited in the claims. When the difference between the claimed invention and the prior art is some range or other variable within the claims, the applicant must show that the particular range is *critical*, generally by showing that the claimed range achieves unexpected results relative to the prior art range. In re Woodruff, 16 USPQ2d 1934.

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

**Art Unit: 1616**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SABIHA QAZI, PH.D  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Sunday, June 27, 2004